

REMARKS

Introduction

Claims 1, 4, 8, 11, 15, and 18 are hereby amended. Claims 5, 12, 19, and 22-28 were previously cancelled. The pending application continues to include claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21.

Applicants thank the Examiner for taking the time to conduct a personal interview with the Applicants' representatives on October 8, 2008. A summary of the substance of the interview is reflected in the following remarks.

Reconsideration of the pending application is respectfully requested in view of the following:

(1) The Claims are Allowable over the Prior Art Because the Prior Art Fails to Disclose an Extension that Includes a Set of Classes Defined in an Object-Oriented Programming Language, Wherein the Services are Consumed by the Set of Classes

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Murray et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,874,143, "Murray"). Reconsideration of these rejections is respectfully requested because the prior art fails to disclose an extension that includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented programming language, wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions, wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes.

As an initial matter, Applicants respectfully submit that Murray does not qualify as prior art 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Applicants' application was filed on February 25, 2004, and claims priority to provisional application 60/451,340, filed on February 28, 2003. Applicants' effective filing date predates Murray's issue date of May 29, 2005. Furthermore, Applicants can find no indication that Murray's application was published more than one year prior to Applicants' effective filing date.

One embodiment, as disclosed by Applicants, is a computer-based extendable application framework that includes a plurality of extensions to extend an application. See, e.g., paragraph [0020] of the Applicants' specification, as well as Fig. 1. An extension includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented language. See, e.g., paragraph [0020] of the Applicants' specification, as well as Fig. 1. An extension may expose and consume services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions. See, e.g., paragraphs [0020] and [0023] of the Applicants' specification. More specifically, the services are consumed by an extension's classes. See, e.g., paragraph [0023] of the Applicants' specification. The computer-based extendable application framework advantageously allows extensions to create an extendable infrastructure in which other extensions can participate. See, e.g., paragraph [0024] of the Applicants' specification.

In contrast to Applicants' embodiments, and as discussed in the October 8, 2008 interview, none of the cited prior art is directed to a computer-based extendable application framework, as recited in claim 1. Specifically, in contrast

to the cited prior art, independent claim 1 recites "a plurality of extensions to extend an application, wherein an extension includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented programming language; wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions, wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes."

Murray does not disclose these features, as recited in claim 1. Rather, Murray discloses downloading a software extension that is hosted on an Internet server. Murray further discloses that additional files are also hosted on the Internet server and that the additional files describe aspects of the software extension. Specifically, the additional files include files that describe a logical attachment of the extension to the program or platform, as well as files that describe the location of the extension files. See Murray at Abstract.

In setting forth the rejection, the Office cites col. 22, lines 45-46 of Murray and asserts that receiving EDFs and merging them as a single list reads on Applicants' claimed limitations of an extension that exposes and consumes services associated with another extension. See page 4 of the Office Action. The Office's assertion that the EDF is the claimed extension is contrary to the Office's earlier assertion that the EDF is the claimed service. See page 3 of the Office Action. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Office's assertions.

In col. 22, lines 45-46, Murray discloses that an EDFHub 1700 receives all of the EDFs and merges them together and exposes them as a single list. Taken

into context, Murray discloses that EDFs “describe logical attachments” to an application program or software platform. See Murray at column 6, lines 48-51. Murray discloses that the architecture includes a collection of one or more attachment points, including a funnel structure known as an EDFHub 1700, which uses the attachment points to combine the EDFs. See Murray at column 22, lines 40-45 and column 23, lines 10-19. Murray, however, does not disclose the features of claim 1, such as an extension that “includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented programming language; wherein each one of the plurality of services is associated with an extension in the plurality of extensions; wherein one of the plurality of extensions exposes and consumes services associated with another extension in the plurality of extensions, wherein the services are consumed by the set of classes.” Nowhere does Murray disclose that the EDF includes a set of classes programmed in an object-oriented language. Instead, Murray discloses that the EDF is implemented in XML, a markup language, to “logically describe” an extension. See Murray at column 6, lines 62- 67. Moreover, Murray’s disclosure of merging EDFs into a single XML list cannot anticipate or render obvious Applicants’ claimed features because Murray does not disclose that services are consumed by a set of classes, as required. As such, Murray does not anticipate or render obvious the features, as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 and independent claims 8 and 15, which recite similar limitations, are allowable over the cited prior art. The

remaining claims depend from claim 1, claim 8, or claim 25, and are also allowable for at least the above reasons.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully request favorable action in connection with this application.

The Examiner is invited and urged to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

No fee is believed to be due for this submission. Should a fee be required, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any such fee to Womble Carlyle's Deposit Account No. 09-5028.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 21, 2008



Kathy Takeguchi (Reg. No. 55,988)
Womble, Carlyle, Sandridge & Rice
P.O. Box 7037
Atlanta, GA 30357-0037
703-394-2270